

CHAPTER TEN **Conclusions and Implementation Issues**

The CMP has several interrelated elements intended to foster better coordination among decisions about land development, transportation and air quality. The development and update of the Alameda County program has surfaced several issues requiring further attention by the CMAs.

CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be reached about the CMP relative to the requirements of law and its purpose and intent.

The Alameda County CMP fulfills the spirit and intent, as well as the requirements of the law.

Specifically, the Congestion Management Program:

1. Contributes to maintaining or improving transportation service levels.

The projects and programs contained in the CMP are a subset of the Capital Investment Program adopted in the Alameda County 2001 *Countywide Transportation Plan*, the long-range transportation plan for Alameda County. The CMP can be viewed as the short-range implementation program for the *Countywide Transportation Plan*. As the first step towards the year 2025 projects and programs, the CMP is making progress toward maintaining or improving transportation service levels.

2. Conforms to MTC's criteria for consistency with the Regional Transportation Plan.

Table 19 lists MTC's consistency requirements for CMPs in the Bay region. All these requirements have been met by the Alameda County CMP.

3. Provides a travel model whose specifications and output are consistent with MTC's regional model.

The model has undergone exhaustive scrutiny at the local and subregional level and is fully validated. The model was transmitted to MTC in early May, 1991, for a finding of consistency, and received a finding of consistency for both the 1991 and 1993 CMPs. Further, the CMA completed a comprehensive effort to update the countywide model in 1997 to keep pace with changes made recently by MTC and to enhance the reliability of traffic forecasts produced by the countywide model. The model is currently being updated and will build from MTC's Regional Travel Demand Model. Completion of the new model is anticipated for Summer 2006.

4. Is consistent with MTC's Transportation Control Measures Plan.

The transportation control measures plan has been incorporated in the BAAQMD's 1997 Clean Air Plan for the Bay Area. As shown in Appendix E, the CMP includes many project types and programs identified in the plan. Appendix E lists the 2001 CMP capital improvements program and its relationship to state and federal transportation control measures. The CMA will work with the BAAQMD and project sponsors to define appropriate responsibility and timely implementation of these measures. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the CMP is consistent with the plan.

5. Specifies a method for estimating roadway level of service that is consistent with state law. The Alameda County CMP specifies the use of the *Highway Capacity Manual* approach for assessing level of service. This is one of the two approaches permitted by the law. The 1985 *Highway Capacity Manual* will be used. Infill opportunity zones are specifically exempt from LOS standard requirements.
6. Identifies candidate projects for the Regional Transportation Improvement Program and federal Transportation Improvement Program which meet MTC's minimum requirements. The *Regional Transportation Improvement Program* and federal *Transportation Improvement Program* candidates listed in the CMP's Capital Improvement Program (Chapter 7) have been evaluated and all candidate projects conform to MTC's screening criteria.
7. Has been developed in cooperation with the cities, the county of Alameda, transit operators, the BAAQMD, MTC, adjacent counties, Caltrans and other interested parties. The process used to update the 2005 CMP included circulation of proposed policy papers and draft documents to interested parties through regular mailings for ACTAC, the CMA's Plans and Programs Committee, and CMA Board meetings. The mailing list included technical representatives of all cities in Alameda County, the county of Alameda, transit operators, the Port of Oakland, the Alameda County Transportation Authority, the BAAQMD, MTC, Caltrans and ABAG. In addition, the designation of the CMP network will be coordinated with adjacent counties within the MTC region and is expected to be consistent with those congestion management programs. The 2005 update will be widely circulated for review by interested public agencies and the public.
8. Provides a forward-looking approach to dealing with the transportation impacts of local land-use decisions. The Land-Use Analysis Program provides for consultation with the CMA early in the land-development process. This early input will help assure a better linkage between land-use decisions and transportation investment.

Table 19 — Summary of MTC's Regional Consistency Requirements For CMPs

RTP Consistency

- Have the RTP goals and objectives been included in the CMP?
- Does the CMP include references to Resolution 3434?

Definition of the CMP System

- Have all State highways and principal arterials been included?

- Are all state highways identified?
- Has the CMA developed a clear, reasonable definition for "principal arterials" as part of its submittal plan?
- Has this definition been consistently applied in the selection of arterials to include in the designated system? If not, why?
- How does the CMP-designated system relate to MTC's Metropolitan Transportation System in the *Regional Transportation Plan*?
- Does the CMP System connect to the CMP Systems in adjacent counties?

Air Quality Requirements

- Does the CMP include locally implementable Federal and State TCMs, as previously documented and included in MTC's Transportation 2030, MTC Resolution 2131, and the BAAQMD's 2000 Clean Air Plan?

Modeling Consistency

- Is the modeling methodology consistent with the methodology adopted by MTC? Is the modeling methodology documented?
- Is the "base case" forecasting network limited to the approved Transportation Improvement Program? Is the data base consistent with the data base used by MTC?
- Are "ABAG consistent" demographics used? If alternative demographics have been used in addition to the "ABAG consistent" forecasts, have the demographic inputs and travel forecasts been compared to the "ABAG consistent" based travel forecasts?
- Are the regional "core" assumptions for auto operating costs, transit fares and bridge tolls being used, or are reasons to the contrary documented?
- Does the forecasting model include transit and carpool use (through either a person trip generation model or a "borrowed share" approach)?
- Does the model produce trip distribution results that are reasonably consistent with those of MTC?

Level-of-Service Consistency

- Is level of service to be assessed by a method in Circular 212, the 1985 or 1994 *Highway Capacity Manual*? If not, has MTC found the methodology consistent with the HCM?

RTIP/TIP Requirements

- Are the proposed RTIP projects consistent with the Transportation 2030?
- Do the projects proposed for inclusion in the RTIP meet the minimum screening requirements established by MTC for the RTIP?

Process

- Has the CMP been developed in cooperation with all concerned agencies, i.e., transit agencies, applicable air quality district(s), MTC, adjacent counties, etc.?
- Has the CMP been formally adopted according to the requirements of the legislation?

Note: Detailed requirements for regional consistency are outlined in MTC Resolution 3000, revised June 2005. The supporting documentation's can be obtained at the CMA Offices.

IMPLEMENTATION ISSUES

During the development and update of the CMP for Alameda County, several issues have been uncovered which will need further action by the CMA. Some of these implementation issues may also require action by the Legislature.

1. Funding to support the CMP, including adequate capital resources and CMA/local government funding

The CMA has identified the cost of maintaining or improving transportation service levels through the year 2025 as part of the *Countywide Transportation Plan*. This cost is large and well beyond existing funding sources. Therefore, further statewide attention to transportation funding will be necessary, if the CMP law is to achieve its intended goal.

The CMP law also imposes significant costs on local government that are not uniform throughout the urbanized areas of the state. In southern California, existing transportation commissions are the designated CMAs. These commissions have funding resources available to them for the CMP not available in the Bay region. The result is that a higher percentage of Proposition 111 fuel tax subventions will be devoted to CMP administration in the Bay region than in southern California. These inequities among different parts of the state may not have been intended by the author of the legislation (Assemblyman Katz).

With the passage of the federal Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 and Transportation Efficiency Act in 1997, new requirements have been placed on MTC relative to congestion management. MTC is passing funds through to the CMAs in the Bay region to assist in implementing the 1991 Act. These funds, however, do not fully cover the cost of CMA administration.

2. Ability of the CMA to influence transportation investment when most transportation funding programs are beyond the purview of the CMP legislation

Funding programs such as transit operating funds, most transit capital funding, the interregional road program, the highway rehabilitation program and the toll bridge program are outside the CMP. The interregional road program and highway rehabilitation program are administered directly by Caltrans. How can the CMA fulfill the intent of the CMP legislation if so many programs are beyond its authority?

3. Responsibility for monitoring and maintenance of level of service on the state highway system

CMP law indicates that Caltrans is responsible for monitoring level-of-service standards on the state highway system, if the CMA designates responsibility to Caltrans.¹ These are state-owned facilities, and it would be reasonable to assume that the state is responsible. The CMA will continue to work with Caltrans on the level-of-service monitoring process to ensure that consistent level-of-service results can be maintained if the CMA delegates future monitoring responsibilities to Caltrans.

The CMP law also recognizes that responsibility for sustaining level-of-service standards on local roadways and the state highway system should be shared between the local government where the roadway is found and other local jurisdictions which contribute significant a percentage of traffic. This change in state law recognizes that other jurisdictions may be partially responsible for the roadway exceeding the standards and that local government has little authority over the state highway system. Some exemptions, such as interregional trips, have been built into the current law, but these exemptions do not deal sufficiently with the problem. Corridor-level planning may offer the most reasonable approach to this multi-jurisdictional problem.

4. Potentially conflicting goals of the CMP and air quality programs

The CMP law is aimed at reducing congestion, while the air quality laws are directed at reducing vehicle emissions. These two goals can conflict. For example, staggered work hours and flextime can reduce peak-period congestion, but may result in essentially the same number of vehicle trips being made throughout the day. Congestion-related smog would be reduced, but not as much as if the vehicle trip were completely replaced by a walk or bicycle trip. Therefore, the CMA will need to work with the BAAQMD to identify strategies that accomplish both goals and then agree upon the applicability of other strategies to one or both of the goals.

5. Modification to the CMP network

The CMP network will be reviewed every four years, beginning with the 2003 CMP. Since it was reviewed in 2005, the next review will be done in 2009. Those additional roadways that meet the criteria for inclusion will be added. However, State law does not provide incentives to local jurisdictions to add roadways to the CMP network. In fact, there are significant disincentives to adding roadways that may in the future deteriorate to LOS F resulting in deficiency plan requirements and the risk to local jurisdictions of losing Proposition 111 gas tax funds.

6. Transportation revenue shortfalls

State and federal transportation funding continues to be inadequate to address both capital and transit operating costs. The shortfalls may jeopardize our ability to maintain and improve transportation levels of service. Worsening traffic congestion on the CMP-designated roadway system will trigger requirements for local jurisdictions to prepare and adopt deficiency plans, or risk losing Proposition 111 gas tax funds

¹ Katz, Statutes of 1995

Table 20 — Implementation Schedule

TASK	WHO	WHEN
Identify Potential Routes	Jurisdictions	January 2007
Review Routes	ACTAC/Board	February 2007
Collect Traffic Data	Jurisdictions	March/April 2007
Review Data	ACTAC/Board	May 2007
Select CMP Designated Routes	ACTAC/Board	June 2007
Incorporate Routes in 2007 CMP	ACTAC/Board	June 2007
Review Criteria for Adding Roadways	Jurisdictions	January 2009
Update Criteria in 2009 CMP	ACTAC/Board	June 2009

Note: Criteria for adding roadways will be reviewed in one CMP update and the adopted criteria will be applied to identify potential routes in the subsequent CMP update.

In order to be in compliance with the CMP, each jurisdiction must submit potential CMP-designated routes to the CMA by June 30, 2007. The identification of routes must be based on 24-hour counts taken in spring 2007.

Intentionally Left Blank